

Leo R. Beus (admitted *pro hac vice*)
L. Richard Williams (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Lee M. Andelin (Utah Bar No. 10830)
Thomas A. Connelly (admitted *pro hac vice*)
K. Reed Willis (admitted *pro hac vice*)
BEUS GILBERT PLLC
701 North 44th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85008
Telephone: 480-429-3000
lbeus@beusgilbert.com
rwilliams@beusgilbert.com
landelin@beusgilbert.com
tconnelly@beusgilbert.com
rwillis@beusgilbert.com

James T. Burton (Utah Bar No. 11875)
Brian D. Tucker (Utah Bar No. 12265)
Joshua S. Rupp (Utah Bar No. 12647)
KIRTON McCONKIE PC
36 South State Street, Suite 1900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: 801-328-3600
jburton@kmclaw.com
btucker@kmclaw.com
jrupp@kmclaw.com

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF UTAH CENTRAL DIVISION

<p>ClearPlay Inc.,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">vs.</p> <p>DISH Network L.L.C., and EchoStar Technologies L.L.C.,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Defendants.</p>	<p>Case Number: 2:14-cv-00191-DN</p> <p>LOCAL PATENT RULE 4.2(f) JOINT STATUS REPORT REGARDING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION HEARING</p> <p>Judge David Nuffer</p> <p>Magistrate Judge Brooke C. Wells</p>
--	--

Pursuant to LPR 4.2(f), ClearPlay and Defendants submit this joint status report regarding the parties' proposals for the nature and form of the claim construction hearing pursuant to LPR 4.3. The parties have met and conferred regarding the claim construction and propose the following.

Time Length: The parties propose three hours for the claim construction hearing. The parties request, pursuant to LPR 4.4, that a live technology tutorial be held with each side presenting a tutorial.

Arguments: The parties propose that arguments happen on a claim term by claim term basis, with each side presenting on the claim term before proceeding to a subsequent term. The parties propose arguing the terms in the following order:

1. Start/stop (end) position/indicator;
2. Filtering action;
3. Position code;
4. Output device;
5. Configuration identifier; and
6. Displaying a representation including a description of each of the plurality of navigation objects.

The parties agree for the Court to decide the constructions of (1) portion of the multimedia content defined by the particular navigation object; and (2) object store on the papers without any arguments.

Nature of Hearing: The parties do not believe live testimony is needed during the claim construction hearing. The parties anticipate using exhibits, slides, handouts or other demonstratives during the hearing, and will exchange these exhibits pursuant to LPR 4.3.

DATED this 9th day of March, 2018.

By: /s/ James T. Burton

BEUS GILBERT PLLC

Leo R Beus

L. Richard Williams

Lee M. Andelin

Thomas A. Connelly

K. Reed Willis

KIRTON McCONKIE PC

James T. Burton

Brian D. Tucker

Joshua S. Rupp

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

By: /s/ Brent O. Hatch

HATCH, JAMES & DODGE, P.C.

Brent O. Hatch

Lara A. Swensen

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Alex V. Chachkes

Alyssa Caridis

Briggs M. Wright

Attorneys for Defendants